DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 082 SP 030 431

AUTHOR Hughes, Jeff; Sanford, Bob
TITLE 1978 and 1984 Faculty of Education Graduates: Perceptions of Their Teacher Education Program.
INSTITUTION Manitoba Univ., Winnipeg. Faculty of Education.
PUB DATE Feb 88
NOTE 45p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; *Education Majors; Foreign Countries; Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Program Attitudes; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Schools of Education; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Manitoba

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relative worth of the various components of the teacher education program offered to graduates of the University of Manitoba for the years 1978 and 1984. Because it was assumed that teachers' assessments of the value of various aspects of their training program would change with experience, two populations with different years of experience since graduation were selected, totaling 352 teachers. As representatives of the less experienced group, teachers in their second year of service were chosen. For the "experienced" sub-sample, people were selected who were mature and experienced but still sufficiently close to their training to be able to make valid judgements. There were 155 useable returns of the questionnaire (a 44% response rate). The questionnaire was arranged in four sections: (1) personal descriptive data; (2) opinions on the value of academic and professional components of the program in post-graduate work; (3) attitude toward program components; and (4) general or global issues related to education. A copy of the questionnaire is appended. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED298082

Research and Information Report

1978 and 1984
FACULTY OF EDUCATION GRADUATES:
PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

Jeff Hughes (Ph.D.)
Bob Sanford (Ph.D.)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M.J. Hughes

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

This report was supported by a grant from
the Dean's Office, Faculty of Education
University of Manitoba
February 1988

Faculty of Education
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Canada

SP 030 431

1978 and 1984

FACULTY OF EDUCATION GRADUATES: PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

Jeff Hughes (Ph.D.)
Bob Sanford (Ph.D.)

This report was supported by a grant from
the Dean's Office, Faculty of Education
University of Manitoba

February 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Research Report

Introduction 1

Subjects 3

Instrument 3

Data Analysis 4

Results and Discussion

Frequencies 4

Analysis of Variance 7

Analysis Using "t" Tests 9

Conclusions 13

Implications for Program Change 15

References 19

Tables 21

Appendix A

Questionnaire 35

1978 and 1984 Faculty of Education Graduates: Perceptions of their Teacher Education Program

Introduction

An essential quality for an organization is a built in self-renewing capacity to enable it to adapt to changing internal demands and to changes occurring within society as a whole (Ratsoy,1984). This ability is essential for an Education faculty because of continually expanding social responsibilities placed on education by society, and the demands this places on graduates for new knowledge and skills. However, Education faculties may be poorly equipped to deal with change (Wideen,1984), partly because of inertia in the decision making process and partly because of the lack of research data upon which to base decisions for innovation. Under these circumstances the problem of devising an effective model for training teachers for our present society remains a difficult challenge for teacher educators who must respond by research of critical problems in the education of teachers. One critical problem is blending the theoretical and practical components, a task that has been so poorly accomplished as to cause Education faculties to be scorned as insufficiently intellectual by academics and insufficiently practical by teachers. According to the most recent surveys, the preference of teachers and trainees is to devote more time to field experiences (Fotiu, 1986; Greene, Miklos & Conklin, 1987) even though not all researchers agree that more time produces better results (Clifton & Covert, 1977; Covert, 1986). Despite a lack of research support for the value of field experience, internship remains a topic of considerable interest and is frequently recommended as a means of improving the quality of teacher education (Creek & Vollmer, 1984; Hegg, Ewanchyna, Maltby, Partridge, Straub & Dirk,1986; Saunders, 1985). One innovation which addresses the problem of combining the theoretical and practical components proposes alternating periods of theoretical input and practical experience, and places considerable importance on the role of personal reflection by the student, as the integrating element (Russell, 1984; Schon, 1982). An example of this strategy is the Praxis Model (Vayro,1986) which alternates action, through school experiences of approximately four weeks duration, and reflection on this experience during time spent in lectures and seminars.

Another consistent topic of concern in the literature and in surveys of graduates of teacher education programs has been the failure of these programs to prepare students for the professional responsibilities associated with classroom management (Denton, Tsai, & Chevrette,1985; Fotiu, 1986; Lasley, 1985; Minier, 1985). Brophy (1984) identifies classroom management as the single most successful example

of reseach in to teaching so it is rather surprising that it continues to be poorly presented. Not only is the topic well explored but the critical strategies are identified and well defined. Classroom management, then, serves as an example of the problems encountered in developing change in teacher education programs due, not to lack of research, but to institutional inertia.

An issue related to classroom management is the different ways students within different levels of teaching think of their responsibilities. A report dealing with interaction in the classroom (Norton, 1987) indicated that students training for the elementary grades placed a dominant emphasis on pupil related decisions while students training for the secondary level were more oriented to content. This report may have relevance to the concern over classroom management among many Junior High School teachers, and concerns among many teacher educators of differences they find in the attitudes to teaching, between elementary and secondary trainees. These findings may imply a need to accommodate to these differences by devising slightly different training programs for elementary and secondary trainees.

Recommendations for substantial changes in teacher education are by no means a recent phenomenon. Twenty years ago Andrews (1967) identified structural and organizational changes he felt necessary to produce quality teachers for the eighties including proposals for a differentiated staffing arrangement, as exists in other professions, and a one-year post-baccalaureate internship. Similar recommendations were made at a recent conference on the problems of professional preparation and professional development of teachers (Newton, 1986). The conference report identified the need for teacher education to be viewed not only as pre-service training but as continuing education lasting throughout the teachers' career. The lack of continuing education is regarded by Taylor (1981) as a neglected aspect of the professional development of teachers. Sedlak (1987) suggests that the existing career structure for teachers is dysfunctional in the face of changing social conditions and recommends a substantial internship period and differentiated staffing as necessary changes for the teaching profession. It seems clear that among critics of current policies for teacher education there is a significant body of opinion advocating internship as a means of developing better teachers and differentiated staffing as a means of retaining these teachers in the classroom.

Devising an effective model for the professional preparation of teachers remains an elusive goal. Even programs which once seemed ideal need to be modified in the light of social and educational change. Such modification, to be worthwhile, must be based on both a clear understandiing of present goals and needs and a valid assessment of current programs. The concern of the present

study was to examine the relative worth of the various components of the teacher education program offered to graduates of the University of Manitoba for the years 1978 and 1984.

Ideally, the success of a teacher education program should be measured by the teaching ability of its graduates. Rating teacher success, however, is an extremely difficult undertaking, both for political reasons and because of the lack of adequate instrumentation. Therefore we have attempted what appeared to be the next best thing which was to study teachers' perceptions of the value of the program as it relates to their own classroom performance. Because we hypothesized that teachers' assessment of the value of various aspects of their training program would change with experience, we selected two populations with different years of experience since graduation. It was assumed that the major role change undergone by student teachers and teachers in their first year of service would be likely to interfere with the kind of perspective we were seeking so we chose as our less experienced group teachers in their second year of service. For our "experienced" sub-sample we selected people who, though mature and experienced in their perspective, would still be sufficiently close to their training to be able to make valid judgments. It was felt that the perceptions of these two groups would constitute a valuable source of data which would assist us in evaluating our present program.

Method

Subjects:

The subjects of the survey were graduates of the University of Manitoba Faculty of Education for the years 1978 and 1984 who had completed all their undergraduate coursework at the University of Manitoba and were currently teaching in public schools in Manitoba. Questionnaires were distributed to the combined group totalling 352 teachers. From these 155 useable returns were received which representing a return rate of almost 44%.

Instrument:

The instrument was a questionnaire designed by the authors and consisted of a series of questions arranged in four sections. Section A consisted of personal descriptive data. Sections B and C focussed on the opinions of the respondents to specific questions regarding the components of their programs. Section D dealt with more general or global issues related to education. The first draft was administered to a group of graduate students in the Faculty of Education. The final revised copy was distributed by mail to all subjects as identified by the Teacher Certification and Records Branch of the Manitoba Department of Education. A copy of the instrument is provided in Appendix A.

Responses to the question of program route were classified in two separate ways: the first distinguishes between those who completed either a Bachelor of Education

degree (BEd), or took the Certification year after an undergraduate degree (AD) or who completed their program by including some additional courses involving Physical Education, Music, Home Economics or Industrial Arts (OT). The second classification involved assigning graduates to either the elementary stream (ELEM) or the secondary stream (SEC) as to their teaching focus, irrespective of whether they were in the BEd, AD or OT route.

Data Analysis:

Responses were coded and analysed using the following statistical packages of SPSS: Frequencies; "t"tests; Oneway with Tukey test.

Results and Discussion

Frequencies:

Characteristics of the sample are represented in Table 1

Table 1 about here

These data indicate that the sample was relatively evenly divided on the factors of age (under or over 29), year of graduation ('78/'84), and participation in additional University courses. The sample was also evenly divided on program route (Bachelor of Education [BEd] or Certification year after initial degree [AD] and Certification together with a combined degree or diploma program [OT]); also on program stream (elementary [ELEM] or secondary [SEC]). On the other hand the data indicate differences in sex distribution, with women outnumbering men by more than two to one, and in satisfaction with teaching, where the overwhelming proportion of both men and women responded that they were satisfied or very satisfied with their career in the teaching profession. In all but this last question the responses would suggest that this sample was representative of the general body of teachers. However, the large proportion of this sample expressing satisfaction with teaching could be interpreted as indicating that the respondents to the questionnaire may have constituted a biased sample who responded to the questionnaire because of their overall satisfaction with teaching as a career.

Section B of the questionnaire asked respondents to rate (using a 5 point scale) specific aspects of the program identified as of concern to many teacher educators. These data are reported in Table 2.

Table 2 about here

The two items referring to academic course content have the highest means (3.5), reflecting a somewhat positive level of satisfaction with this aspect of the program. Responses to questions about the theoretical course content varied from means of 3.0, (adequate) for two items relating to instructional sequences and child development, to means

below 3.0 reflecting a somewhat poor level of satisfaction for the three items relating to lesson planning, classroom management and classroom organization.

Comparison of the ratings of the academic course content with those of the theoretical course content indicates a higher level of satisfaction with the academic courses. The academic courses rated positive whereas the ratings for the professional course content was either adequate or slightly negative. In particular the ratings were especially low for the items relating to adequacy of the program to prepare students in the areas of classroom management and classroom organization.

Summary of data from Section B: The data on satisfaction with course content indicate a generally favourable attitude toward academic course content and a somewhat unfavourable attitude toward professional course content, with the areas school organization and classroom management identified as especially unsatisfactory.

Section C of the questionnaire focussed on key components of the teacher education program as specified in Faculty literature and asked respondents to rate these by satisfaction with the adequacy with which they contributed to their development as a teacher (Scale 3), the amount of time spent on the component (Scale 2), and the sequencing of the component (Scale 1). The means for the ratings on the three scales are reported in Table 3.

Table 3 about here

The means for Scale 3 indicate negative reactions to the components School Organization and Social Foundations of Education, positive reactions to Academic courses, Education Electives, Psychology of Learning and Instruction, Curriculum and Instruction, Seminar and School Experience, and very positive reactions to Micro-teaching and Student Teaching. Satisfaction levels with respect to time spent in the program (Scale 2) confirm trends evident in Scale 3. The data indicate that respondents would prefer more time be devoted to those components relating to the practical aspects of teaching (Student Teaching, Seminar and School Experience, Curriculum and Instruction and Micro-teaching). They also indicated a preference for less time in Social Foundations of Education and marginally less time in Academic courses and School Organization.

Interpretation of the data on sequencing of the program components again confirms the previous trend. The trend was to identify the practical components, together with Education Electives and Curriculum and Instruction as being preferred earlier in the program. Taken together, the data from from Scale 1 and Scale 2 indicate that respondents think more time should be devoted to the practical components and that these should be offered earlier in the program.

In addition to the comparison of the individual items from each of the three scales of Section C, the items of Scale 3 were grouped to create three categories of courses in the training program. These categories are identified as follows:

(1) academic component (item C1),
(2) theoretical component (items C2+C3+C4+C5+C6)
(3) practical component (items C7+C8+C9).

The means for satisfaction with these three components are reported in Table 4.

Table 4 about here

These data indicate a variation in satisfaction levels from a rating of "adequate" for the theoretical components through "positive" for the academic components to "very positive" for the practicum components. Although there is some variation in the ratings of the various items that make up the theoretical component no item in this component was rated as favourably as the lowest rating reported for the practical component. There appears to be a clear preference by the respondents for the practical aspects of their training program which they viewed very favourably compared to the theoretical aspects, which they rated as merely adequate.

Summary of data from Section C: In summary the data from Section C provide rather strong evidence that the respondents were very satisfied with the practical components of the program, wanted more time devoted to these components and wanted these components introduced earlier in the program. In contrast there was evidence to suggest that the respondents were not well satisfied with the contributions of the components Social Foundations of Education and School Organization, they further felt that less time should be spent on these components.

Section D asked a set of questions referring to specific issues involved with the teaching profession and teacher education in general. The first question asked respondents whether their perceptions since graduation had changed regarding what was important to know as a teacher. The mean of 2.6 (on a 3 point scale) indicates a strongly affirmative response. This item may imply that this sample of teachers have come to the conclusion, as a result of their teaching experience, that more emphasis should be given in a teacher education program to practical issues.

The second question asked whether teachers favoured the inclusion of a one year internship as part of a professional training program leading to certification. The mean of 2.5 (on a 3 point scale) indicates generally strong support for this suggestion. This response may not be unexpected given the strong support for more practical aspects of the program from this particular sample of teachers. A related question (item 3) asked for a response to a proposal requiring

teachers to update their certification at regular intervals through successful completion of upgrading courses. The mean response to this suggestion of 1.9 (3.0) indicates that this suggestion was viewed in a slightly negative fashion by this sample of practicing teachers.

Two questions (items 4 & 5) required teachers to rate their teaching ability at the end of their training program compared to their present ability. The means of 3.5 and 4.4 (on a 5 point scale) respectively indicate that the sample felt they were reasonably competent at the end of their training and had become even better teachers since graduation. When asked to indicate the factors that had contributed most to their growth as teachers since graduation the respondents gave overwhelming endorsement to experience, with virtually no support for the role of further university courses.

Item 7 asked respondents to assess the length of their training program. The mean of 3.0 (5.0) suggests that the length of their programs (BEd= 4 years, AD= 1 year) was an item on which their opinions were neutral. The final question asked respondents to rate their overall reaction to their teacher education program of studies. The mean of 2.9 (5.0) for this question indicates that this sample held a slightly negative view of their experience in the teacher education program at the University of Manitoba.

Analysis of Variance:

A major focus of the present enquiry was to identify differences in attitude among the various categories of graduates who had taken all their program at the University of Manitoba. An analysis of variance was carried out on the means for the major groups in the survey, the four year Bachelor of Education program (BEd), the one year after degree program (AD) and the graduates from combined routes (OT). Tne data from these analyses relating to their satisfaction with various aspects of their program are reported in Table 5.

Table 5 about here

A Tukey test for the multiple comparison of means was carried out on those variables with reported significant levels of probability. These data are reported in Table 6.

Table 6 about here

Data from Tables 5 and 6 indicate that the attitude of the AD and OT groups to the academic aspects of the program was more fovourable than that of the BEd group. Both the AD and OT groups viewed Academic courses: general knowledge (item B1) and Academic component (C1, Scale 1) more favourably than the BEd group while the AD group only viewed

the variable Academic courses: subject area (item B2), more favourably than the BEd group. As can be seen from the means the significant difference is due not to a negative attitude by the BEd group but rather to a generally very favourable attitude by those in the AD and OT groups towards the academic aspects of their program.

By contrast the BEd group were more favourably disposed than the AD group to the following items from Scale 3 of Section C of the questionnaire: Education electives (C2), Curriculum and instruction (C6), and Student teaching (C8). As can be seen from the means, the significant difference is due not to a negative attitude by the AD group but rather to a generally very favourable attitude by those in the BEd group. The mean scores indicate attitudes that range from neutral to slightly favourable for all items except Student Teaching where both groups produced very high means, indicating a strong positive attitude to this practical component of the program. The mean of 4.7 (5) for the BEd group indicates an extremely high positive attitude to Student Teaching, with only ten respondents (7%) giving a rating of three or lower on the five point scale.

Attitudes to time spent in the program (Scale 2) and the sequencing of courses in the program (Scale 1) provide significant differences on four variables. The data for the Analysis of Variance and Tukey tests on these variables are reported in Table 7 and Table 8 respectively.

Table 7 & 8 about here

Ratings for the time spent in Education Electives of the BEd group were significantly more favourable than those of the AD group. The relatively high mean for the BEd group suggests that the source of the difference between the two groups is a desire by the BEd group for more time to be spent on elective courses. For Scale 2 a composite score (Time) was derived by adding all items. The result indicates a more favourable attitude by the BEd group than the AD group toward the amount of time spent in the program.

For attitude to the sequencing of courses in the program a significant difference between the BEd and AD groups was to be found on two items. The BEd group produced a mean indicating a neutral response to the positioning of Social Foundations of Education (C3), whereas the AD group produced a very low mean (1.08), indicating a strong desire for this component to be offered earlier in the program. For the Curriculum and Instruction (C6) component the means for both groups were low, but that of the BEd group was especially low indicating a strong desire for this component to be offered earlier in the program.

Summary of data from the analysis of variance: These data indicate important differences between the attitudes of the BEd and AD groups toward several components of the teacher education program. These differences may be interpreted as indicating a stronger level of satisfaction

for the more practical aspects of the program by the BEd group and a much greater satisfaction level by the AD group toward the academic components.

Analyses using "t" tests:

Data on the pattern of program undertaken by respondents were classified first according to the route taken (BEd, AD, OT) and second whether they were training to teach in the elementary school (ELEM) or the secondary school (SEC). Data on the comparison of the means for the elementary and secondary streams are reported in Table 9.

Table 9 about here

Very significant differences ($p<.001$) were found between the elementary group and the secondary group on three variables (B1, B2, C1) relating to the academic aspects of the program. For each of these variables the secondary group expressed greater satisfaction with the academic aspects of the program than did the elementary group. With respect to the amount of time devoted to academic courses the elementary group expressed a rather strong preference for less time, whereas the secondary group were slightly in favour of more time for this aspect of the program.

A very significant difference ($p<.001$) between the groups existed on the issue of the sequencing of the Curriculum and Instruction courses (C6), with the elementary group expressing the opinion they should be offered earlier in the program. The same trend is evident in regard to School Organization (C4) where the difference between the groups is smaller but still significant ($p<.05$). There is also a significant difference ($p<.05$) between the groups on the Education Electives component, with the elementary group preferring that more time be devoted to this component of the program.

Summary of "t" tests between elementary and secondary groups: There is strong support for the notion that the elementary and secondary groups have different opinions regarding the contribution of the academic aspects of their program. Although the opinion of both groups is favourable, that of the secondary group is more favourable and they would prefer that more time be devoted to this aspect of the program. By contrast the results indicate the elementary group preferred that the Curriculum and Instruction and School Organization components occur earlier in their program and that more time be allocated to the Education Electives.

In addition to the comparisons carried out between the elementary and secondary groups comparisons were made on groups based on year of graduation, age, sex and the taking of further University studies since graduation. Data on the comparison of the means for year of graduation are reported in Table 10.

Table 10 about here

The most significant finding from this analysis indicates that on the basis of the Components Combined score the 1984 graduates were slightly more satisfied with their program than were the 1978 graduates. Although differences between the two groups existed on a number of other variables these differences did not appear to have any clear pattern. The 1984 group indicated they favoured more time for Education Electives (C2), less time in School Organization (C4) and earlier placement of Curriculum and Instruction (C6), whereas the 1978 group favoured more time in Seminar and School Experience (C7) and preferred ealier placement of the Psychology of Learning and Instruction (C5) and Social Foundations of Education (C3) components. These differences do not appear to indicate any clear pattern other than a weak trend for the 1978 group to be more favourable to the theoretical aspects of the program. But this trend was not consistent with the indication that the 1978 group favoured more time in the Seminar and School Experience component. The explanation for this lack of a clear trend may lie in the differences in the program components existing between the years 1978 and 1984.

The ages of respondents were reclassified to produce two groups, one under the age of 29 and the other group 29 years or older. The data for the differences between means on this variable are reported in Table 11.

Table 11 about here

These data may be interpreted as indicating that the younger age group was more satisfied with the contribution of the program components, especially Curriculum and Instruction (C6), that they would like more time for this component, and wished it to occur earlier in the program. In addition the younger group favoured more time for Education Electives (C2) and less time for School Organization (C2). In contrast the older group were more satisfied with the contribution of the academic courses toward their general development as teachers and with the contribution of academic courses to their preparation for specific subject knowledge. These differences suggest that the younger group was more favourable to the practical aspects of the program whereas the older group was more favourable to the Academic aspects of the program. Because age and year of graduation are likely to be highly correlated it is perhaps not surprising that the data for the age groups and the data for the year of graduation were similar on several important variables.

Differences in attitude between men and women are reported in Table 12.

Table 12 about here

Women expressed more satisfaction than men with knowledge of Child Development (B5), the Curriculum and Instruction component (C6), their present teaching ability (D5), and their overall assessment of teaching as a career (A8). They also preferred that less time be devoted to Academic component (C1) and to the Social Foundations of Education component (C3). In addition, they preferred that the Curriculum and Instruction (C6) and the Student Teaching (C8) components be offered earlier in the program. On most items the responses of the men were in the same direction as the women. The exceptions were that the men were slightly dissatisfied with their knowledge of Child Development (B5) and the Curriculum and Instruction (C6) components but wanted more time devoted to the Academic Component. Considered together these differences indicate some differences in attitude between men and women, with women having very favourable attitudes towards the more practical and applied aspects of the program than the men, even though the men also rated these aspects as valuable. However, the interpretation of the relationship between sex and attitude towards the program components is complicated by the factors of program route (BEd /AD) and the program stream (ELEM / SEC). To clarify this relationship a further analysis of the data was carried out on these factors and is reported in Table 13.

Table 13 about here

The most significant finding from this analysis clarifies the relationship of sex and program route on attitude to Academic Courses. Inspection of the data indicates that differences are determined by program stream (ELEM / SEC) rather than sex, with the secondary students more favourable in each of the four comparison groups. Comparison of male - female differences reveal that in three of the four comparison groups females are actually more favourable then their male counterparts, and that in the one grouping where the differences are reversed (SEC / AD) the rating by the female goup is actually the second highest rating awarded.

A second finding of significance relates to the attitude to the Curriculum and Instruction component, where the difference is based on sex, with the females significantly more favourable to this component than the males. Of the four possible comparison groups it is only for the SEC / BEd group where the score for the males exceeds that of the females. A comparison of attitudes for the males and females in the ELEM stream reveals that scores for females exceed, or are equal to that of the males for every one of the comparisons. The differences between the two groups is not so evident for the SEC stream where in the AD route the scores for females exceed those of the males six to three, but where for the BEd route the scores for males exceed those of females by the same score. Among the remaining

comparisons possible, no trends are evident for the factors of sex, program route or program stream.

One further set of comparisons of relevance is that of the actual ratings for a number of the components. For example, the ratings for Social Foundations of Education and School Organization are uniformly low for all subgroups reported in Table 13. Of the sixteen means rated for these two courses all are below the median with the exception of one score which was at the level of the median. By comparison the ratings for each of the practical components (Seminar and School Experience, Student Teaching, Micro-teaching) are uniformly high, with two scores of five, and only one score falling below four. The clear indication of these comparisons is that the low ratings for some theoretical components and the high ratings awarded the practical components were not the result of bias by any one subgroup, but were a consequence of a quite consistent expression of feelings across all subgroups in the study.

One final comparison was carried out on the variable of whether or not the respondent had taken further University courses. The data indicated that there were no significant differences between the groups on this variable. This finding may not be surprising in view of the fact that in response to the question regarding what had helped them develop as a teacher since graduation, none of the respondents identified university courses as making a major contribution.

Summary of data analysis using the "t" test: A relatively clear trend emerges indicating significant differences in the way specific aspects of the program are perceived by different subgroups of respondents. The strongest trends are evident between subgroups representing different patterns of program. For example the SEC group and the AD group both express moderate to high levels of satisfaction with the academic aspects of the program and would favour more time being allocated to this area. By contrast the ELEM group and the BEd group expressed very high levels of satisfaction with the practical components of the program and a strong opinion in favour of more time being allocated to these components. Similar though smaller differences are evident between the male and female respondents, with the female group expressing a very favourable opinion of the practical components and the Curriculum and Instruction component. A similar trend is evident between the older and 1978 graduates, and the younger and 1984 graduates, with the former responding more favourably to the academic aspects of the program and the latter expressing the opinion that more emphasis be devoted to the practical components.

A second trend relates to the perception by respondents of the contribution of different components of the program to their preparation as teachers. The overall response of the sample was to rate the practical components "very positive", to rate the academic components "positive," and

to rate the theoretical components as "adequate". These data indicate that three, and even nine years after completing their program, graduates do not have a positive opinion of the theoretical components but have a very positive opinion of the practical components.

Conclusions

The data obtained from the questionnaire were analysed by a variety of descriptive and statistical techniques which provided a consistent pattern of significant trends. One of these trends, with important implications for teacher educators, was the attitude of the sample to the overall program and its various components. Despite the fact that the respondents indicated a high level of satisfaction with their career as a teacher and rated themselves as very competent teachers, their overall reaction to the program that prepared them to work in their profession was slightly negative (X=2.9 on a 5 point scale). A further unfavourable result was obtained from the means of Section C (Scale 3) of the questionnaire, which provided a score (on a 5 point scale) for three major components of the program, namely, the practical component (X=4.2), the academic component (X=3.8) and the theoretical component (X=3.0). These means, derived from the opinions of 155 graduates of the Faculty of Education of the University of Manitoba in 1978 and 1984, provide a clear indication of their preference for the practical aspects of the program and their relatively low opinion of the theoretical component. Further analysis of the scores for the theoretical component indicated that, in particular, respondents were dissatisfied with the Social Foundations of Education and School Organization components. Written comments by respondents suggested these components were irrelevant and had little to do with education. By comparison written comments generally were complimentary of most of the practical components, which several respondents stated provided the only things they learned in the teacher education program! Such a negative opinion of the teacher education program and of the theoretical component in particular, do not of course, represent a definitive view of the value of the program, nor of the worth of its various components. On the other hand, the views expressed do represent the way the program is actually perceived by those for whose education it was designed, and therefore cannot lightly be ignored.

A second major issue arising from the data relates to the different perceptions held by students in different routes of the program. For example although most students valued the practical aspects of the program the students in the Bachelor of Education (BEd) and Elementary (ELEM) groups rated this aspect significantly more valuable than did the students in the After Degree (AD) and Secondary (SEC) groups. In addition the BEd / ELEM groups, although favourable to the Academic component wanted less time devoted to that component and expressed negative attitudes

towards the theoretical components, Social Foundations of Education and School Organization. By contrast the AD / SEC groups, in addition to rating the practical components highly, also indicated they valued the contribution of the Academic components and were more favourable than the BEd / ELEM groups to theoretical components such as the Social Foundations of Education and School Organization. These findings suggest the possibility that the two groups represent two distinct populations of students with different interests and perhaps different aptitudes and motivations with regard to the teaching profession. If this is so, it suggests that design of the programs should take into account these factors and consider differences in course content, sequencing of content, and methods of presenting content for students in different program routes. Similar though less significant trends were evident in the data relating to year of graduation and age. There was only weak support for the hypothesis that 1978 graduates, as compared to 1984 graduates, would have a more favourable view of non-practical aspects of the program. Although there was weak support for this finding the extent of these differences were not sufficient to justify any proposition that experience and maturity among teachers will eventually lead them to a fuller understanding of the importance of the non-practical components of the program.

The main emphasis in the reactions to the program was the overwhelming endorsement of the practical components of the program as the most valuable aspect. This opinion was further confirmed by the quite substantial support (66%) received for the suggestion of an internship as part of the requirement of teacher certification. By contrast the suggestion for updating of qualifications at regular intervals received only limited support (yes=38%, no=43%). These data indicate that teachers continue to value the practical aspects of their training even many years after their training and do not give much support to the need for compulsory updating of qualifications. One further finding with implications for the teacher education program is that teachers generally rate themselves as very good teachers and indicate that their continued professional growth as teachers resulted from experience, advice from other teachers and in-service training. The contribution of further university training to professional growth was either ignored or rated very low by the 150 respondents to this question. Evidently the pre-service teacher education program had not created, in this sample of teachers, a belief that the Faculty of Education had a role to play in their continued growth as teachers.

The broad implications to be drawn from these findings are that the teacher education programs of the 1978 and 1984 graduating years evaluated in this study, despite the many virtues they may have had, were not perceived as adequate or relevant by many of the students they were meant to serve. In particular the non-practical aspects of the professional

program were not rated as adequate by a majority of the respondents. These teachers were, however concerned with problems relating to curriculum, instruction, and classsroom management but indicated these topics were generally not presented at all or were poorly presented during their training program. The failure of past programs to deal adequately with these concerns no doubt affected the attitude of the respondents, who generally indicated they regarded the Faculty of Education as largely irrelevant to their continued professional growth of teachers.

The results appear to have important implications for the design of future programs in the Faculty of Education. The authors, however, do not imply that the opinions of the graduates represent any kind of authoritative wisdom which must dictate the direction of future changes in program design. Indeed, the authors would find themselves in disagreement with many of the opinions expressed by the majority of respondents. Even so, the authors would argue that the opinions expressed by the respondents represent an important and legitimate voice in the evaluation process and an opinion which needs to be taken into account in any effort to design a more appropriate and effective program. It does not appear inappropriate to conclude that a program judged in slightly negative terms by its graduates is failing in its mandate. The remedy required may lie in a major reconceptualization of teacher education, especially with regard to the relationship between theoretical and practical components of a program.

Implications for program change

The results of a survey like the present one must obviously be interpreted with care. Even though the return rate was over 40% it is possible that the respondents were motivated by an above average level of dissatisfaction with their professional training (or an above level of satisfaction with teaching as a profession). Perhaps a more serious difficulty is the temptation to use results such as these in a simplistic manner. If, as they did, most respondents indicate a greater degree of satisfaction with "practical" as opposed to "theoretical" components, this might appear to indicate a need to increase the one at the expense of the other. If the sole function of teacher education institutions were socializing prospective teachers to schools as they now exist, this course of action might be appropriate, but to the extent that the role of those institutions is to effect educational improvement and to ensure a minimal lag between social and institutional change, we must be concerned to encourage teachers to be able to view education from a critical perspective. This perspective requires awareness of educational issues which go beyond the immediate concerns of classroom management and lesson planning. To the extent that this awareness creates cognitive discomfort for people who must work in an already overstressed environment there is a natural tendency to

embrace what is seen as immediately useful and to reject the merely "theoretical" and this tendency exists even among the more experienced sample of teachers.

However, what is clear from the present findings is a general dissatisfaction with the non-practical aspects of the professional program which is too great to be dismissed or ignored. Regardless of how highly we value these "theoretical" components, we must concede that the low opinion recorded by "beginning" and " experienced" teachers alike will inevitably vitiate their impact on teaching performance. If seen as largely irrelevant by a majority of teachers, they will be heeded only to the extent needed to acquire a teaching certificate.

Although it is not within the scope of this investigation to produce a blueprint for an improved teacher education program, the results strongly suggest that, to the extent that the programs evaluated in this study were not substantially different from the existing program, certain courses of action ought to be considered to improve existing practice. The implications of the data obtained from this study suggest the following actions:

1. A radical revision of the program to ensure a more effective integration of theory and practice. The frequency with which written comments referred to the irrelevancy of theoretical courses indicates that their relevance to classroom practice was not well established by faculty members and not well understood by a majority of students. One strategy for accomplishing this integration would be to associate classroom practice more closely with the content of theoretical courses and to ensure that the content of theoretical courses and the requirements of practical activities are co-ordinated and reflected a developmental sequence appropriate and realistic for pre-service teachers. The suggestions in the literature of the need for a more reflective model of teaching preparation with more substantial blocks of field experience early in the program, appears to be a suggestion worthy of serious consideration.

2. A re-organization of the sequencing of courses in the program to correspond more to the perceptions of students as to their training needs. Current practice places several of the more theoretical courses at the beginning of the training program, but these courses are not well received by most students, possibly because they are not developmentally receptive to the concepts presented at that stage of their professional development. One negative consequence of the present timing may be that issues central to the development of a critical and enlightened teaching profession are not well understood, or are even rejected by an audience for whom the issues have long term significance. It may be argued that this is a consequence of students not having the the breadth of life experiences, nor the practical experiences of teaching necessary to effectively assimilate the information and appreciate its relevance for the teaching profession. It appears evident that the

majority of pre-service teachers are concerned with "survival" skills and regard information not related to this issue, as largely irrelevant. It therefore seems necessary to take these views into account and develop a more appropriate sequence for the delivery of the components of the teacher education program. Included in this development would be the notion of compulsory continuing education course requirements. Despite the slightly negative views of respondents to this question such a requirement is a legitimate and viable means of ensuring that teachers are given the opportunity, at specified intervals, to re-assess their philosophy of teaching.

3. The inclusion in the program of more specific information related to theoretical and practical aspects of classroom management. Although many faculty would claim that classroom management issues were included as topics in several courses, the perceptions of most respondents to the questionnaire was, that the topic was either not dealt with at all, or was dealt with in a cursory fashion. However, current conditions within the classroom mean that pre-service teachers need much more sophisticated knowledge and skills for classroom management than were required previously, when an authoritarian classroom environment prevailed, and this information does not lend itself to being presented incidentally. To develop the competence necessary for the effective management of classrooms in today's schools, students require the systematic presentation of information related both to the theoretical understanding of the behavioural principles involved, and practical applications for the classroom. This information should be delivered in two different courses (or modules), the first dealing with more basic issues and delivered to coincide with initial teaching experiences, and a second, more advanced course delivered after the initial teaching experiences have been completed and time has elapsed to allow for adequate reflection of those experiences. The arguments presented here could equally well be applied to the issue of "effective teaching". Our interpretation of the data from the questionnaire suggests that many of the problems with the program, identified by the respondents, reflect the fact that too little emphasis has been placed on the systematic study of the literature relating to effective teaching.

4. The provision of different teacher education programs to students in the BEd / ELEM groups and students in the AD / SEC groups. The recommendation is based on evidence that a difference exists between the attitudes of the students in these two groupings toward the Academic component, and that this difference is sufficient to require a different emphasis within the training program. It is perhaps important to emphasize that the attitude of the BEd / ELEM group towards the Academic component was quite positive but remained well below that of the AD / SEC group. This may suggest that the existing academic requirements for

the BEd / ELEM group are not as closely tied to their professional development needs as are the requirements for the AD / SEC group. However, it is beyond the scope of the present study to specify the exact nature of the program modifications required to accommodate to the differences in attitude to this component.

5. The incorporation into the program of some form of internship. The strong support offered by the graduates to this option reinforces the opinion held by many faculty that such an option offered late in the program would provide graduates with a greater sense of proficiency before taking up their first appoinments. This period of transition, from student to teacher, would provide short term benefits to the student and their first year pupils, and a long term benefit to the student by ensuring a better long term adjustment to the demands of the teaching profession.

References

Andrews, L.O. 1967. A curriculum to produce career teachers for the 1980's. Reproduced in Theory Into Practice, 1987, Vol.26, 502-511.

Brophy, J.E. 1984. Research on teaching and teacher education: The interface. In P.P.Grimmett Research in Teacher Education: Current Problems and Future Prospects in Canada. Centre for the Study of Teacher Education, U.B.C.

Clifton , R.A. & Covert, J. 1977. Practice teaching as a professionalizing experience. Paper presented at Canadian Society for Study in Education, Saskatoon.

Covert, J. R. 1986. A study of the quality of teaching of beginning teachers. ED 273-604.

Creek, R.J. & Vollmer, M.L. 1984. The educational internship: A teacher training model for the nineties. ED 261-006.

Denton, J.J., Tsai, C.Y. & Chevrette, P. 1985. Perceptions of former students on degree of emphasis to place on pedagogical topics. ED 261-997.

Fotiu, R. Freeman, D. & West, B. 1986. Undergraduate follow-up study: Spring 1985, Research and Evaluation in Teacher Education: Program Evaluation Series No. 11.

Greene, M.L., Miklos, E. & Conklin, R. 1987. Evaluating the effectiveness of Alberta's teacher education programs in preparing classroom teachers. ED 280-825.

Hegg, K., Ewanchyna, C., Maltby, P., Partridge, W., Straub, R. & Dirk, J. 1986. Internship and its implications. In J.Irvine & J. Webster (Ed.) Take stock - Take action. Proceedings of the 1986 Annual Conference of the Western Canadian Association for Student Teaching, U.M.

Lasley, T.J. 1985. Classroom management: perspectives for the pre-service teacher. ED 261-025.

Minier, J. 1985. Inservice education for professors: A second look at classroom management. ED 280-823.

Newton, A.E. 1986. Teacher quality: An issue brief. ED 282-882.

Norton, R.A. 1987. Divining and defining a problem space: An investigation of pre-service teachers' interactive thinking. ED 280-815.

Ratsoy, E. 1984. Program evaluation in teacher education: A critical analysis. In P. Grimmett (Ed.) Research in Teacher Education: Current Problems and Future Prospects in Canada. Centre for the Study of Teacher Education, U.B.C.

Schon, D. 1982. The reflective practitioner. New York: Basic Books.

Russell, T.L. 1984. The importance and challenge of reflection-in-action by teachers. In P.P.Grimmett Research in Teacher Education: Current Problems and Future Prospects in Canada. Centre for the Study of Teacher Education, U.B.C.

Saunders, R.L. 1985. The pre-service education of teachers. ED 264-193.

Sedlak, M.W. 1987. Tomorrows teachers: The essential arguments of the Holmes Group Report. In J.F.Soltis (Ed.) Reforming Teacher Education. Teachers' College, Columbia.

Taylor, W. 1981. Theory to practice. Edmonton, Alberta: Alberta Advanced Education and Manpower.

Vayro, C. 1986. Becoming a teacher: The Praxis Model. In J.Irvine & J. Webster, (Ed.) Take stock- Take action. Proceedings of the 1986 Annual Conference of Western Canadian Association for Student Teaching. U.M.

Wideen, M.F. 1984. Priorities for research in Canadian teacher education. In P.P.Grimmett (Ed.) Research in Teacher Education: Current Problems and Future Prospects in Canada. Centre for the Study of Teacher Education, U.B.C.

TABLES

TABLE I

Characteristics of the Sample (n-155)

Label		Frequencies	Valid Percentages
Age	-29	63	43
	+29	83	57
	No response	9	-
Sex	Male	48	31
	Female	107	69
Year of Graduation	1978	67	43
	1984	88	57
Pattern of Program	B.Ed.	75	47
	A.D.	68	44
	Other	14	9
	Primary	78	50
	Secondary	77	50
Additional University Courses			
	No	81	52
	Yes	74	48
Satisfaction With Career as a Teacher			
	Very Unsatisfied	11	7.1)
	Unsatisfied	6	3.9) 11
	Neutral	9	5.8 6
	Satisfied	66	42.6)
	Very Satisfied	63	40.6) 83

TABLE 2

Graduate Rating of Specific Aspects
of Program Content

Specific Aspects of Program Content	Code	Means & S.D.'s	
Academic content			
knowledge for teaching	B_1	3.5	.2
knowledge of subject area	B_2	3.5	.2
Theoretical content			
lessons planning	B_3	2.8	.3
instructional strategies	B_4	3.0	.3
child development	B_5	3.0	.3
classroom management	B_6	2.3	.4
classroom organization	B_7	2.4	.4

TABLE 3

Means for Satisfaction Level of Program Components

Program Components	Means (and SD's) Scale 3: (5 point scale) Components of Program	Scale 2: (3 point scale) Time in Program	Scale 1: (3 point scale) Sequencing of Program
Academic courses	3.8 (.9)	1.9 (.5)	1.9 (.2)
Education Electives	3.3 (1.0)	2.2 (.6)	1.7 (.5)
Social Foundations of Education	2.5 (.9)	1.6 (.6)	1.9 (.4)
School Organization	2.6 (1.0)	1.9 (.7)	2.0 (.5)
Psychology of Learning & Instruction	3.4 (.9)	2.2 (.6)	1.8 (.5)
Curriculum & Instruction	3.4 (1.1)	2.5 (.5)	1.7 (.6)
Seminar and School Experience	3.9 (1.0)	2.5 (.6)	1.7 (.5)
Student Teaching	4.5 (.7)	2.7 (.4)	1.5 (.6)
Micro-Teaching	4.2 (.9)	2.4 (.6)	1.7 (.6)

TABLE 4

Means Satisfaction Levels for Three Categories of the Program Components

Categories (from Scale 3)	Means (and SD's)	
Academic courses (C_1)	3.8	(.9)
Theoretical courses $C_2+C_3+C_4+C_5+C_6$	3.0	(.6)
Practical courses $C_7+C_8+C_9$	4.2	(.6)

TABLE 5

Analysis of Variance for Satisfaction

With Program X Program Route

Dependent Variable	Code	Source of Variation	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Academic courses -general content	B_1	Between groups	2	14.8	7.4	6.9***
		Within groups	152	161.6	1.0	
Academic courses -knowledge content	B_2	Between groups	2	8.4	4.2	3.5*
		Within groups	151	182.0	1.2	
Academic component	C_1	Between groups	2	9.0	4.5	5.7**
		Within groups	142	112.8	.7	
Education Electives	C_2	Between groups	2	7.7	3.8	3.6*
		Within groups	137	146.0	1.0	
Curriculum and Instruction	C_6	Between groups	2	9.1	4.5	3.8*
		Within groups	139	163.6	1.1	
Student Teaching	C_8	Between groups	2	3.5	1.7	3.5*
		Within groups	141	70.1	.4	

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

TABLE 6

Tukey Tests for Satisfaction With Program X Program Route

Dependent Variable	Code	Means (and SD's)			Groups Significantly Different
		B.Ed.	A.D.	O.T.	
Academic courses -general content	B_1	3.2	3.7	4.0	OT>B.Ed. AD>B.Ed.
Academic courses -knowledge content	B_2	3.2	3.7	3.7	AD>B.Ed.
Academic component	C_1	3.5	3.9	4.3	OT>B.Ed. AD>B.Ed.
Education Electives	C_2	3.5	3.0	3.2	B.Ed.>AD
Curriculum and Instruction	C_6	3.6	3.1	3.6	B.Ed.>AD
Student Teaching	C_8	4.7	4.3	4.4	B.Ed.>AD

TABLE 7

Analysis of Variance for Satisfaction With Time and Sequencing of Program

Dependent Variable	Code	Source of Variation	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Education Electives (time)	C_2	Between groups	2	6.6	3.3	7.8***
		Within groups	140	59.6	.4	
Time (Scale 3)	C_{1-9}	Between groups	2	76.9	38.4	3.2*
		Within groups	147	1727.2	11.7	
Social Foundations of Education (sequence)	C_3	Between groups	2	1.8	.9	4.2**
		Within groups	127	27.6	.2	
Curriculum and Instruction (sequence)	C_6	Between groups	2	4.8	2.4	6.8***
		Within groups	142	50.6	.3	

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

TABLE 8

Tukey Test for Satisfaction With Time and Sequence of Program

Dependent Variable	Code	Means			Groups Significantly Different
		B.Ed.	AD	OT	
Education Electives (time)	C_2	2.4	1.9	2.1	B.Ed.>AD
Time (Scale 2)	C_{1-9}	19.6	18.1	18.5	B.Ed.>AD
Social Foundations of Education (sequence)	C_3	2.0	1.8	2.1	B.Ed.>AD
Curriculum and Instruction (sequence)	C_6	1.5	1.9	1.7	AD>B.Ed.

TABLE 9

't' Test for Satisfaction With Program X

Elementary and Secondary Streams

Dependent Variable	Code	Means		't' value
		Elementary	Secondary	
Academic courses -general content	B_1	3.2 (1.0)	3.9 (1.1)	-3.8***
Academic courses -knowledge content	B_2	3.1 (1.0)	3.8 (1.0)	-4.27***
Academic component (Scale 3)	C_1	3.5 (.9)	4.1 (.8)	-3.8***
Academic component (Scale 2)	C_1	1.7 (.5)	2.1 (.4)	-4.7***
Education Electives (Scale 2)	C_2	2.3 (.6)	2.1 (.7)	2.0*
School Organization (Scale 1)	C_4	1.9 (.5)	2.1 (.5)	-2.1*
Curriculum & Instruction (Scale 1)	C_6	1.5 (.5)	1.9 (.5)	-3.8***

2 tailed probability

* $p < .05$

*** $p < .001$

TABLE 10

't' Test for Attitude to Program X Year of Graduation

Dependent Variable	Code	Means		't' value
		1978	1984	
Education Electives (Scale 2)	C_2	2.0 (.7)	2.3 (.6)	-2.3*
Social Foundations of Education (Scale 1)	C_3	1.8 (.5)	2.0 (.4)	-2.1*
School Organization (Scale 2)	C_4	2.1 (.6)	1.8 (.7)	2.85**
Psychology of Learning and Instruction (Scale 1)	C_5	1.7 (.5)	1.9 (.5)	-2.0*
Curriculum and Instruction (Scale 1)		1.8 (.6)	1.6 (.6)	1.93*
Seminar & School Experience (Scale 2)		2.6 (.5)	2.4 (.6)	2.26*
Components (Scale 3)	C_{1-9}	28.3 (6.5)	30.5 (4.8)	-2.2*

For 2 tail probability
* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE 11

't' Test for Attitudes to Program X Age

Dependent Variable	Code	Means & SD		't' value
		-29	29+	
Academic courses -general content	B_1	3.2 (1.0)	3.7 (1.0)	-2.5**
Academic courses -knowledge content	B_2	3.2 (1.0)	3.6 (1.0)	-2.5**
Education Electives (Scale 2)	C_2	2.4 (.6)	2.0 (.6)	3.1**
School Organization (Scale 2)	C_4	1.7 (.7)	2.0 (.6)	-2.5**
Curriculum and Instruction (Scale 1)	C_6	3.7 (1.0)	3.2 (1.0)	2.68**
Curriculum and Instruction (Scale 2)	C_6	2.6 (.5)	2.4 (.5)	1.9*
Curriculum and Instruction (Scale 3)	C_6	1.6 (.6)	1.8 (.5)	-1.9*
Components	C_1-C_9	31.1 (5.1)	28.3 (6.0)	2.8**

For 2 tail probability

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE 12

't' Test For Attitude to Programs X Sex of Respondent

Dependent Variable	Code	Means		't' Value
		Male	Female	
Child Development	B_5	2.7	3.1	-2.3**
Academic component (Scale 2)	C_1	2.1	1.9	2.44**
Social Foundations of Education (Scale 2)	C_3	1.8	1.5	2.23*
Curriculum & Instruction (Scale 3)	C_6	2.9	3.6	-3.08**
Curriculum & Instruction (Scale 1)	C_6	1.9	1.6	2.09*
Student Teaching (Scale 1)	C_8	1.6	1.4	2.00*
Present Teaching Ability	D_5	4.3	4.5	-2.17*
Satisfaction with Career	A_8	3.7	4.1	-2.20*

2 tail probability * $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE 13

Means* For Adequacy of Program Components X Program Route (B.Ed./A.D.) Program Stream (Elem/Sec) and Sex (M/F) of Respondents

Program Components	Elementary				Secondary			
	B.Ed.		A.D.		B.Ed.		A.D.	
	M (n=7)	F (n=47)	M (n=7)	F (n=17)	M (n=9)	F (n=19)	M (n=19)	F (n=22)
Academic courses	3.4	3.5	3.3	3.7	3.9	4.2	4.4	4.2
Education Electives	2.8	4.0	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.4	3.2	2.9
Social Foundations of Education	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.5	2.1	2.2	2.5	2.6
School Organization	2.6	2.8	2.6	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.5	2.3
Psychology of Learning & Instruction	3.1	3.9	3.0	4.0	3.4	3.3	2.2	3.0
Curriculum & Instruction	2.4	3.7	2.3	3.6	3.9	3.6	2.7	3.3
Seminar & School Experience	3.7	3.9	4.1	4.3	4.1	3.7	3.6	3.7
Student Teaching	4.1	4.7	4.4	4.4	5.0	4.6	4.2	4.3
Micro-Teaching	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.3	5.0	4.3	3.7	4.1

* Ratings on a 5 point scale

APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE

GRADUATE EVALUATION OF THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

Section A: Socio-demographic data.

Coding Office Use Only

1. Age: ___yrs — /1/1/1/ (1 2 3)

2. Sex — 1 Male ___ / 2 Female ___ — /1/1/1/ (4 5)

3. Year of graduation — 1- '78 ___ / 2- '84 ___ — /1/1/ (6)

4. Pattern of program: — /1/1/ (7)

B.Ed.	1- Early Childhood	___
	2- Elementary	___
	3- Secondary (Math & Sc)	___
	4- " (Humanities)	___
After Degree	5- Elementary	___
	6- Secondary (Math & Sc)	___
	7- " (Humanities)	___
Other	8- B.Ed./B.Music	___
	9- B.Ed./B.Hc.	___
	10- B.Ed.(Phys.Ed. major)	___
	11- U.M./R.R.C.C.	___
		___

/1/1/1/ (8 9)

5. Mark the grades you are currently teaching and whether or not you are teaching subjects and the grade levels for which you were trained.

	Currently teaching	Subjects trained for (YES or NO)	Trained for this grade level (YES or NO)
K	___	___	___
1	___	___	___
2	___	___	___
3	___	___	___
4	___	___	___
5	___	___	___
6	___	___	___
7	___	___	___
8	___	___	___
9	___	___	___
10	___	___	___
11	___	___	___
12	___	___	___

/1/1/1/ (10 11)

/1/1/1/ (12 13)

/1/1/1/ (14 15)

6. In previous teaching appointments have you taught subjects or grade levels for which you were not trained? 1-NO ___ / 2-YES ___ — /1/1/ (16)

If NO, go to question 7.

If YES, please complete below:

Grades taught _____

Subjects taught _____

7. Since graduation have you taken any University courses? 1- NO ___ / / 17
2- YES ___

If YES, please specify type of course or program undertaken:

_____ _____

_____ _____

8. How satisfied are you now with your career as a teacher?

1 very unsatisfied	___	/ / 18
2 unsatisfied	___	
3 neutral	___	
4 satisfied	___	
5 very satisfied	___	

Section B: General section.

IN THIS SECTION YOU ARE ASKED TO RESPOND TO THE QUESTIONS USING A 5-POINT RATING SCALE
1-very poorly
2-poorly
3-adequately
4-quite well
5-very well
YOU ARE INVITED TO ADD A BRIEF COMMENT IF YOU WISH TO ELABORATE.

(Note: "Academic program" refers to courses taken outside the Education Faculty, "professional program" refers to courses taken in the Education Faculty).

1. Do you feel your academic courses provided you with a sufficiently broad general education to provide the knowledge necessary for good teaching? 1-2-3-4-5 / / 19

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

2. Do you feel your academic courses provided you with sufficient knowledge of your particular subject area? 1-2-3-4-5 / / 20

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

3. Do you feel the professional program prepared you adequately in knowledge and use of curriculum so as to be able to prepare appropriate lessons and instructional sequences? 1-2-3-4-5 / / 21

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

4. Do you feel the professional program prepared you adequately in knowledge of how to develop lessons and instructional sequences and implement them using appropriate instructional strategies? 1-2-3-4-5 / / 22

5. Do you feel the professional program prepared you adequately with regard to your knowledge about children, child development and the way children learn? 1-2-3-4-5 / / 23

6. Do you feel the professional program prepared you adequately in the area of selecting and implementing appropriate classroom management strategies? 1-2-3-4-5 / / 24

7. Do you feel the professional program you received prepared you adequately as a teacher in the area of classroom organization? 1-2-3-4-5 / / 25

Section C: Attitude to Program Components

IN THIS SECTION YOU ARE REQUESTED TO RESPOND TO THREE QUESTIONS REGARDING YOUR ATTITUDE TO THE COMPONENTS OF YOUR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM; EACH QUESTION HAS ITS OWN RATING SCALE FOR EACH OF THE PROGRAM COMPONENTS; RATE EACH COMPONENT ON EACH OF THE THREE SCALES BY CIRCLING ONE OF THE NUMBERS; (Note: "Academic program" refers to courses taken in other faculties).

SCALE 1: WHAT IS YOUR ATTITUDE TO THE SEQUENCING OF THESE COMPONENTS WITHIN YOUR PROGRAM? 1-needed earlier in program, 2-sequencing about right, 3-needed later in program.

SCALE 2: WHAT IS YOUR ATTITUDE TO THE AMOUNT OF TIME SPENT IN THE PROGRAM IN THESE COMPONENTS? 1-less time desireable, 2-time about right, 3-more time desireable.

SCALE 3: WHAT IS YOUR ATTITUDE TO THE ADEQUACY WITH WHICH THESE COMPONENTS CONTRIBUTED TO YOUR DEVELOPMENT AS A TEACHER? 1-very negative, 2-negative, 3-neutral, 4-positive, 5-very positive

COMPONENTS	SCALE 3	SCALE 2	SCALE 1	
1. Academic courses	1-2 3-4-5	1-2-3	1-2-3	/ / / / 26 27 28
2. Education electives	1-2-3-4-5	1-2-3	1-2-3	/ / / / 29 30 31
3. Social foundations of education	1-2-3-4-5	1-2-3	1-2-3	/ / / / 32 33 34
4. School organization	1-2-3-4-5	1-2-3	1-2-3	/ / / / 35 36 37
5. Psychology of learning & instruction	1-2-3-4-5	1-2-3	1-2-3	/ / / / 38 39 40
6. Curriculum & instruction	1-2-3-4-5	1-2-3	1-2-3	/ / / / 41 42 43
7. Seminar & school experience	1-2-3-4-5	1-2-3	1-2-3	/ / / / 44 45 46
8. Student teaching	1-2-3-4-5	1-2-3	1-2-3	/ / / / 47 48 49
9. Micro-teaching (if not taken circle-NOT APPLICABLE)	1-2-3-4-5	1-2-3	1-2-3	/ / / / 50 51 52

Section D: Perceptions about Teacher Education

1. Have your perceptions changed since graduation about what is important for you to know as a teacher?

YES-3 ___
NO-2 ___
UNDECIDED-1 ___

/ / 53

2. Would you favour the inclusion of a one year internship as part of a professional training program leading to certification?

YES-3 ___
NO-2 ___
UNDECIDED-1 ___

/ / 54

3. Would you favour a proposal requiring teachers to update their certification (for example every 5 to 10 years) through the successful completion of upgrading courses?

YES-3 ___
NO-2 ___
UNDECIDED-1 ___

/ / 55

4. How would you rate your teaching ability at the end of the program?

VERY GOOD-5 ___
GOOD-4 ___
FAIR-3 ___
POOR-2 ___
VERY POOR-1 ___

/ / 56

5. How would you rate your teaching ability now?

VERY GOOD-5 ___
GOOD-4 ___
FAIR-3 ___
POOR-2 ___
VERY POOR-1 ___

/ / 57

6. Since graduation what factors have contributed most to your continuing growth as a teacher? (Rate each of the items 5=very important, 4=important, 3=useful, 2=of little use, 1=not applicable-not used)

EXPERIENCE-1 ___
OWN READING-2 ___
INSERVICE-3 ___
OTHER TEACHERS-4 ___
UNIVERSITY COURSES-5 ___
OTHER-6 ___
(please specify)

/ / / 58 59

7. How would you rate the length of your training program?

MUCH TOO LONG-1 ___
A LITTLE TOO LONG-2 ___
ABOUT RIGHT-3 ___
A LITTLE TOO SHORT-4 ___
MUCH TOO SHORT-5 ___

/ /
60

8. In general, what is your overall reaction to the program of studies you undertook to prepare you as a teacher?

VERY GOOD-5 ___
GOOD-4 ___
ADEQUATE-3 ___
POOR-2 ___
VERY POOR-1 ___

/ /
61

9. Please add any further comments you would like to make about your teacher education program.

(i) What, if any, were the strengths/weaknesses of your training program?

(ii) In view of your teaching experience, what important aspects of teaching do you feel would have been a valuable addition to your teacher education program?